REMARKS

ON THE

PREFACE

TO THE

Protestant Reconciler:

IN A

LETTER

TO A

FRIEND.

[Samuel Thomas]

LONDON:

Printed by *J. Wallis*, for *Joanna Brome*, at the *Gun* in St. *Paul's* Church-yard. 1683.

Errata.

pag. 5. lin. 8. read between and & when, very noxious
p. 7. l. 12. r. and Father Calvin too -- &c.
p. 24. l. 20. r. thus for then.
pag. 29. l. 1. r. hee for wee, & so pag. 37. l. 14.
p. 39. l. 1. r. are, for one.
p. 53. l. 18. r. from, for to.

SIR,

HAving Read and Confider'd the Preface to [*The Proteſtant Reconciler*] I now ſend you theſe Remarks upon it.

The Author profeſſes *Pag.* 58. (of that *Preface*) That he does from his heart Conform to all that is requir'd by the Church of *England*; and yet a great part of the Preface is employ'd in producing Teſtimonies againſt the Lawfulneſs not only of [the Impoſition it ſelf] but alſo of [the things Impos'd;] we are told *p.* 25. out of *Beza*'s Epiſtle to Biſhop *Grindal*, That *Men ſo oft do grievouſly Sin, as they do introduce into the Church of God any Ceremonies ſignificative of Spiritual things*, and *that all Symbolical Rites ſhould be entirely excluded from the Chriſtian Church*; And this (forſooth) muſt have a Hand ſet over againſt it in the margin, as if it ought to be taken for ſome very precious and valuable Truth.

We are told alſo by the ſame Divine, *p.* 26. That *the Right of Croſſing is not to be reckon'd among things Indifferent, but* (as a thing) *rather to be deſtroyed than the brazen Serpent of* Hezekias. That *they do beſt of all who are as diligent in the*

Aboliſhing the Rites of Croſſing in Baptiſm, and Kneeling at the Sacrament, as they would be in Aboliſhing open Idolatry. And this alſo is thought fit to be Printed in another Character, and to be mark'd out with a marginal Hand, as if 'twere a Maxim of Infallible Truth.

A great many other Reproaches of our Ceremonies and their Impoſition, are tranſcribed into the following Pages; as *p.* 27. That *the Impoſing our* English *Ceremonies, is a falling back to worſe than the Ceremonies of* Moſes; *to the Trifles and Refuſe of human Traditions.* That *Queen* Elizabeth *was carry'd with a Zeal not according to Knowledge, in Commanding the Uſe of them.* *Pag.* 28. And that *by that Impoſition, the Fire of Contention was to the incredible offence of the Godly, as it were raiſed from Hell.* That *the white Linen Garments requir'd to be Uſed in Divine Service, are at the leaſt ſigns of Idolatry, and Popiſh Superſtition.* -----*with the Uſe whereof Miniſters defile themſelves, and give offence to the Weak by their Example.*-------That *to retain thoſe Garments is to deſtroy the whole Body of the Church*-----That *they ought not be Impoſed* (*Pag.* 30.) *becauſe all things are to be abandon'd which may any way, either by themſelves or by accident, defile Gods Worſhip,* -----becauſe *they are contrary to the Purity of the Apoſtolical Worſhip, and ſmell of Popiſh Superſtion;*

and

and are neither available to the Edification of the Godly, nor to Order, nor for Ornament, except that which is Whoriſh. ----Becauſe *all Godly men will be offended with the Decree concerning Apparel.* ------And, *it may much further Ungodlineſs, and at leaſt give occaſion of many Evils, and very grievous Superſtitions: and the very Occaſions of Evils are to be ſhun'd,---becauſe 'tis God's Will (p. 31.) That after the Death of Chriſt, all Garments of* Aaron *and* Levi *ſhould be Aboliſh'd.* -----*That the Lord himſelf Commanded that all Ungodly and Vain Ceremonies ſhould be driven away, when he charg'd utterly to deſtroy all things which appertain'd to thoſe who ſhould give Counſel to follow ſtrange Gods; and to burn their Garments and all their Stuff, with Fire, that they might be an execrable thing unto the Lord.* -----Becauſe the Impoſing them *miniſters Offence to the Conſciences of Weak Believers,* ------*which to do is very grievous and diſtaſtful to the Holy Spirit*: and that *Paul's Example of reſolving always to abſtain from Fleſh rather than offend his Brother, gives a general Rule taken out of the Doctrin of Chriſt,* (viz.) *That no Indifferent thing is to be admitted, and yielded to, much leſs to be Urg'd upon others, and leaſt of all to be Commanded by Decree, if in the Admitting, Urging, and Commanding of it, the Minds of Good Men, and Conſciences of the Faithful be Offended.*

Now

Now this *Prefacer* did either look upon these kind of (paultry) Argumentations against our Ceremonies, and their Impofition, and these and a great many other Cenſorious Reproaches of them, as Valid Arguings, and Juſtifiable Reproaches, or he did not; if he did not, to what end has he taken the Pains to Tranſcribe them? unleſs he had a Fanatick Deſign of rendring our Church and State-Conſtitutions, odious by ſo doing? But if he does really judge them Valid and Juſtifiable, he is a ſtrange Man that can *from his heart* Conform to all that is required by the Church of *England*, and yet imagine not only [the impoſing and requiring] the Uſe of its Ceremonies to be both without and againſt the Command of God, but alſo [the things requir'd and impos'd] to be ſome of them *Signs of Idolatry, and Popiſh Superſtition; that Miniſters defile themſelves with the uſe of them,------that they are only for Whoriſh Ornament; and ſuch as whereat the Minds of Good Men, and the Conſciences of the Faithful are Offended; and that ſuch things ought not, for that very reaſon, either to be Impoſed, or ſo much as Admitted, or Yielded to.*

Beſides, if he has Tranſcribed them as Reproaches, in his own Opinion juſtifiable, he has by quoting thoſe Paſſages out of other Writings, made them his own; And he has too plainly done ſo

in

in his re-capitulation, *p.* 42. where he expresly Affirms, That *judicious* Beza [*truly*] *saith, that these things* (*viz.* Ceremonies required by the Church of *England*,) *are not only unnecessary, but profitable for little if a Man use them aright.* And (as if this were not Reproach enough) this *Prefacer* has no more Wit nor Judgement than to Add, *and when they* [*Accidentally*] *do minister to Schism and all its fatal Consequences*: and then again to Approve it as *truly said by* Beza, *That to impose such Ceremonies, is to labour about Hay and Stubble, or rather, things more vain than they:* And himself Affirms, That *sad Experience shews, that they bring no Profit, but many Evils to the Church: and that 'tis our Duty to shun the Occasion of those Evils.* By which Approbation of, and Compliance with these Censures of things required and imposed in our Church, I humbly conceive he has incurr'd the Penalty of Excommunication, which is Decreed by *Can.* 4. against those *who Affirm that the Form of Gods Worship in the Church of* England, *Established by Law, and Contained in the Book of Common-Prayer, and Administration of Sacraments, is a Corrupt, Superstitious, or Unlawful Worship of God, or Containeth any thing in it that is repugnant to the Scriptures.* By Can. 6. against those *Who Affirm that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of*

England,

England, *by Law Eſtabliſhed, are Wicked, Antichriſtian, or Superſtitious.* By *Can.* 10. Conſequentially, For that Canon Excommunicated thoſe Separatiſts from the Church of *England, who take upon them the Name of another Church, and preſume to publiſh that this their pretended Church hath a long time Groaned under the Burden of certain Grievances, impoſed upon the Members thereof, by the Church of* England. And 'tis the driſt of this Man's Preface and Book, to load the Church it ſelf with the Burden of this Reproachful Complaint.

Beſides the Opinion which this Prefacer owns as true, That *the Ceremonies required in the Church of* England, *do bring no Profit, but many Evils to the Church*, is a flat Contradiction to the Doctrin of the 30*th. Canon*, touching the Uſe of the Croſs in Baptiſm, (*viz.*) *That the Chriſtians ſhortly after the Apoſtles Time, uſed it in all their Actions, thereby making an outward Shew and Profeſſion, even to the Aſtoniſhment of the Jews, that they were not aſhamed to Acknowledge Him for their Lord and Saviour, who Dyed for them upon the Croſs. And this Sign they did not only uſe themſelves with a kind of Glory, when they met with any* Jews; *but ſigned therewith their Children when they were Chriſtned, to dedicate them by that Badge to His Service whoſe Benefits beſtowed upon them*

them in Baptiſm, the Name of the Croſs did repreſent; and this Uſe of the Sign of the Croſs in Baptiſm was held in the Primitive Church, as well by the Greeks *as the* Latins, *with one conſent and great applauſe: at what time if any had oppoſed themſelves againſt it, they would certainly have been Cenſur'd as Enemies of the Name of the Croſs, and conſequently of Chriſts Merits, the ſign whereof they could no better endure.*

And what muſt this *Preface*r then be counted, who in complyance with Father *Beza*, Father *Zanchy*, and Father *Calvin*, [redacted] (as he pretends *Pag.* 23.) Cenſur'd this and other Ceremonies as *Fooleries*, and the endeavouring to uphold them, as Labouring about Hay and Stubble, or rather about things more vain than they: and brands them as things bringing no Profit, but many Evils to the Church: whereas this Canon you ſee, expreſly teaches the contrary; and tho' it Acknowledges that *in proceſs of time the ſign of the Croſs was greatly abuſed in the Church of* Rome, *eſpecially after the Corruption of Popery had once poſſeſſed it, yet withal it affirms that the Abuſe of a thing doth not take away the Lawful Uſe of it. Nay ſo far was it from the purpoſe of the Church of* England, (ſays the Canon,) *to forſake and reject the Churches of* Italy, France, Spain, Germany, *or any ſuch like Churches, in*

all things which they held and practiſed, that as the Apology of the Church of England *confeſſeth, it doth with reverence retain thoſe Ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of Sober Men. In which reſpect, among ſome other very Ancient Ceremonies, the ſign of the Croſs in Baptiſm, hath been retained in the Church. For the very remembrance of the Croſs, which is very precious to all them that rightly Believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and in the other reſpects mention'd, the Church of* England *hath retained ſtill the ſign of the in Baptiſm; following therein the Primitive and Apoſtolical Churches, and accounting it a Lawful, Outward Ceremony, and Honourable Badge, whereby the Infant is Dedicated to the Service of Him that dy'd upon the Croſs.*

In the next place I obſerve that this Prefacer confeſſes, *Pag.* 9. that the Biſhops themſelves have no Power to diſpenſe with the Laws [for Uniformity] or *to make any Propoſals for the healing of our Breaches:* and if they have no ſuch Power, I wonder upon what grounds this Author aſſumes to himſelf the Power of making ſuch Propoſals; and ſuch as would deſtroy the Act of Uniformity, and Metamorphoſe the *Common-Prayer-Book*, into a *Directory.*

I know he has produced the Teſtimony of King

King *James*, King *Charles* the Firſt, and King *Charles* the Second, to juſtifie the deſign of his Book; but with how little Reaſon, Candor, and Ingenuity he has done it, I ſhall leave you to judge when you have conſider'd the reflexions I have to make upon them.

As to that of K. *James*, it may ſuffice 1. To remember that notwithſtanding that excellent determination (as the *Prefacer* ſtyles it) his Majeſty was ſo far from changing, or antiquating, or ſo much as diſpenſing with the Ceremonies of the Church of *England*, that he ratified them anew, and gave thoſe Divines who appear'd againſt them at the Conference at *Hampton-Court*, a Severe Reprimand for ſcrupling Conformity to them upon ſuch inconſiderable Reaſons as were then urg'd for thoſe Scruples; and this Eſtabliſhment he continued all his Reign.

2. To take Notice that whereas this Writer calls that which *Caſaubon* repreſents as K. *James* his Opinion [*a golden Sentence*] and which fully juſtifies all which he pleads for; the words of that Golden Sentence as quoted by himſelf, do only affirm, That thoſe things which by the Conſtitutions of Men without the Word of God, were for a time received into the Church of God, [*may be Changed*] *Mollified*, *Antiquated*. And this too is ſo far from being there his

Majeſties peremptory Determination, that 'tis only ſaid, his Majeſty [*Thinks, Conceives, Believes*] they may be antiquated. Whereas this Writer is not content to think our Church-Conſtitutions *May be*, but the whole ſcope of his Book is to prove they *Ought* to be alter'd and antiquated.

3. That which his Majeſty is ſaid to Believe, does in the quotation refer not to *All*, but only to *Moſt* Eccleſiaſtical Obſervations, and therefore it is not evident from that quotation, That our Church-Ceremonial-Obſervations, are in the number of thoſe which the King Conceived might be antiquated.

For which reaſons this firſt quotation ſignified little to this Writers purpoſe, ſuppoſing it a Candid and Impartial quotation, which becauſe I have not that Epiſtle by me, I have not at preſent the opportunity of examining.

But if this *Prefacer* has treated King *James*, in this Teſtimony, no more candidly and ingenuouſly than he has King *Charles* in the next, he has in plain *Engliſh* play'd the Knave with two Kings. For hapning to have the [*Exact Collections*] by me, I conſulted the Kings Anſwer to that Remonſtrance of the State of the Kingdom, and there found (*p.* 26. of that Collection) immediately after the words by him quoted, theſe

theſe following: ——*Provided that this Caſe be attempted and purſued with that modeſty, temper, and ſubmiſſion, that in the mean time the Peace and Quiet of the Kingdom be not diſturbed, the Decency and Comlineſs of Gods Service diſcountenanced, nor the Pious, Sober, and Devout Actions of thoſe Reverend Perſons, who were the firſt Labourers in the Bleſſed Reformation* ——*ſcandaliſed, and defamed.* Which Proviſo being added, does ſo cramp and confine the Condeſcenſion ſpoken of in the former words, that they are on that account rendred inſignificant to the Writers deſign; and ſo they are upon another. For they only ſay, That his Majeſty *would willingly* comply with the Advice of a Parliament, for the making a Law to Exempt Tender-Conſciences from Puniſhment or Proſecution; but does not ſay, either that 'twas [*the duty*] of a Parliament to give him ſuch Advice, nor that [*it was his own duty*] to comply with it when given: and yet nothing leſs than this will ſuffice to make this, or any other Teſtimony pertinent and adequate to this Author's attempt.

For which reaſon therefore his next Teſtimony from the Declaration of King *Charles* the Second, is as inſignificant to his purpoſe as this: For neither in that from *Breda*, nor in the other concerning Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, does his Majeſty Acknow-

Acknowledge it *his Duty at that time* not to impoſe the uſe of the Ceremonies on Tender Conſciences: nor if he had, would it thence follow, either that it is, or that his Majeſty thinks it his duty [*now*] to gratifie them by ſuch an Indulgence: and yet even this alſo is requiſite to make Teſtimonies pertinent to our Authors deſign; which (as himſelf words it *p.* 4. of his Book) is to prove that *things indifferent which may be changed and altered without Sin, or violation of Gods Laws, ought not, eſpecially under our preſent Circumſtances, to be impoſed by Superiors as the Conditions of Communion: or as Conditions without which none ſhall miniſter in ſacred things.*

Beſides, who that has any ſenſe of the meaſures and obligations of *Loyalty*, or ſo much as *Civility*, can think it tolerable in any man, (eſpecially in a Church-man as this Author is ſaid to be) to treat the King at this rate, and to urge this Declaration in the behalf of Diſſenters now, when tis ſo well known that his Majeſty himſelf thought fit to vacate it within two years after its publication, by conſenting to the Act of Parliament for Uniformity: which Act acquaints us that *his Majeſty had duly conſidered the Book of Common-Prayer, as then framed* (which re-impoſed the uſe of the Ceremonies) *and had fully approved and allowed the ſame, and recommended*

mended it to that Parliament, that the ſaid Book ——ſhould be Appointed to be uſed ——under ſuch Sanctions and Penalties as the Houſe of Parliament ſhould think fit—— From which Approbation and Conſent of his Majeſty, we ought to conclude that he was then made very ſenſible how unworthy the Diſſenters were of that Liberty which he at firſt deſigned them, and how miſchievous 'twould prove to the Concerns both of Church and State: and that 'twas neither juſt nor reaſonable it ſhould be allowed them. And accordingly that Act aſſures us, that *nothing conduceth more to the ſetling of the Peace of this Nation—— nor to the honour of our Religion, and the Propagation thereof, then an univerſal Agreement in the Publick Worſhip of Almighty God.*

An excellent determination this! and a very golden ſentence! and yet this Gentleman pretends humbly to conceive the quite contrary (*p.* 8.) and to think that *the united Judgement of the whole Nation cannot frame a better or a more unexceptionable Expedient for a firm and laſting Concord, then the Liberty indulged by the Kings Declaration*, which required neither Ceremonies, nor Subſcription, nor Oath of Canonical Obedience.

But I confeſs he ſpeaks there of an Expedient for a firm and laſting Concord of theſe

[*diſtracted*

distracted Churches] by which expreſſion what the man means would perhaps be worth the knowing: and the rather becauſe the word [*Churches*] is printed in a different Character. A ſuſpicious man may reaſonably enough conjecture that he honours the *Conventicles of Separatiſts* with the Name of *Churches*, in oppoſition to Canon 10. before cited; if not, what Churches in *England* are ſo diſtracted, as to render his unexceptionable Expedient neceſſary to their Concord?

But is not that a very pleaſant Queſtion which he puts (*p.* 9.) If *as the Kings Royal Word aſſures us, the Reverend Biſhops in the Year* 60. *did think ſuch Conceſſions made by his Royal Perſon, and Authority, to allay the* (*then*) *preſent diſtempers very Juſt and Reaſonable, and cheerfully would conform themſelves thereunto, why ſhould we now conceive they ſhould be of another mind in* 82?

To which Queſtion I Anſwer ſeriouſly,

1. That the Kings Royal Word, as quoted by this Writer (*p.* 6.) does not aſſure us that the Biſhops [*did*] *then think ſo*, but only *that his Majeſty had not the leaſt doubt but that they would think ſo.* However, on ſuppoſition he had quoted the Kings Words truly *p.* 9. I Anſwer, 2. We may well conceive it, becauſe his Majeſty

Majesty himself was of another mind in 82. and appears now to be of the same mind he was then, being so far from indulging, that he commands the Laws to be vigorously executed against Dissenters.

But does this man indeed fancy that the Case and Reason of things, is the same now in 82. that those parts of the King's Declaration which he has quoted, represent it to have been in 60? Has he the Simplicity to believe himself, or the Confidence to desire others to believe, that the Dissenters are as innocent now, as that Declaration acquaints us, his Majesty then found those whom he Conferd with?

Can he tell us where these Presbyterians are now to be met with, who *shew themselves* (as it seems those did at the time there spoken of) *Persons full of Affection towards the King, or Zeal for the Peace of the Church and State, and neither Enemies to Episcopacy, nor Liturgy, but modestly desire such Alterations in either, as without shaking the Foundations, may best allay the present distempers?* or can he tell us, where those men of other Persuasions are now to be found, who *all approve Episcopacy, and a set Form of Lyturgy?* (*p. 6.*)

Nay, have not the Leaders of several Parties sadly demonstrated themselves to be men of a

quite contrary temper, ſince the diſcovery of the Popiſh Plot? ſome employing the beſt Reaſon, ſome the beſt Wit they had, others the moſt ungodly Arts that a lying, ſlandring, ſpiteful, malicious humor could ſupply them with, to the prejudice of our Church and its Conſtitutions, and to the rendring not only its *Ceremonies*, but alſo its *Epiſcopacy* and *Lyturgy*, Odious and Ridiculous.

But whatever others may poſſibly think of our Biſhops, and their averſeneſs from condeſcending in matters of Ceremony, this Prefacer, *p. 9.* profeſſes to think with the *Reverend Dean of* Canterbury, that *we have no cauſe to doubt, but the Governonrs of our Church are Perſons of that Piety, and Prudence, that for Peace ſake, and in order to a firm Union among Proteſtants, they would be content, if that would do it, not to inſiſt on little things, but yield them up to the infirmity, or importunity of thoſe that differ from them.*

Which Paſſage having been long ſince ingeniouſly deſcanted upon (in a Folio-Pamphlet, whoſe Title I cannot now call to mind) I ſhall let it paſs, but not without this Profeſſion, that I hope there is now no one *Biſhop*, nor [*would-be-Biſhop*] Living, who would yield, and yield, and yield up ſo much of the Church-Con-

Conſtitutions to Diſſenters, till he has left the Diſſenters nothing to yield up to the Church.

In *p.* 10. the Learned and Judicious Judge *Hale*, is brought in as a Favourer of Condeſcenſion to moderate Non-conformiſts; and as one who drew up a Bill for Comprehenſion of ſome, and a limited Indulgence to others. And this we are told upon the Credit of Dr. *Burnet*, whoſe Teſtimony *Valeat quantum valere poteſt.* Nay, he is brought in as one who declar'd it his Judgement, That *the only means to heal us was a new Act of Uniformity, which ſhould neither leave all at Liberty, nor impoſe any thing but Neceſſary*---- And this we are told upon the Credit of Mr. *Baxter*, who, I doubt, may ſay as the Dr. aforeſaid does of himſelf (in the Preface *p.* 8. to his *Hiſtory of the Rights of Princes*) *I know this will not be the more believed for my ſaying it.*

Now that 'tis not naturally Impoſſible that ſuch words ſhould be ſpoken by Judge *Hale*, who can deny? but that he did actually declare his judgement in thoſe Terms, who can believe, that is at all acquainted with the Parts and Intellectuals of that Great Man?

For ſure he had more Wit than to call that an *Act for* [*Uniformity*] which would leave

men at Liberty, as to the Order, Modes, Circumſtances, and Ceremonies of Publick Worſhip; and more Conſideration than not to reflect that an Act which impoſes nothing but what's Neceſſary, will certainly leave men to that Liberty; and a Perſon of more Skill in the meaſures of Government, and the needs of Human Society, than to propoſe That, as the only means for the healing the breaches of this Nation in matters of Religion, which was never yet made uſe of for the Cementing of any National Society of men, or the effecting Union and Concord among them.

For I dare Challenge this Author (if I had the opportunity) to ſhew me where there is, or ever was ſuch a Society, whoſe Union, Order, and Government, was conſerv'd or deſign'd to be conſerv'd by *the impoſing* on them *nothing but neceſſary things*: meaning by [*neceſſary things*] ſuch only as God's Word has made ſo, and as are contra-diſtinguiſh'd to all things in their own nature Indifferent; and ſo this Prefacer muſt underſtand this Teſtimony, if it be pertinent to the deſign of his Book.

The 16. 17. and 18. Pages are taken up with Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Opinion touching this Affair; which becauſe I had occaſion to conſider ſoon after that Book of his [*the Unreaſonable-*

neſs

neſs of Separation] was publiſh'd, I ſhall now impart to you the reſult of that conſideration; which was

1. That if any one ſhould affirm That that Preface of the Doctors had deſtroyed what he had ſaid for our Church in his Book: And 2. That it has effectually deſtroyed that Church of *England*, which he had taken pains to defend in his Book: I did not ſee how the Doctor could purge himſelf from the Accuſation.

In the third Part of the Book, and twenty ſixth Section, the *Doctor* defends our Churches Terms of Communion, and proves that there's no Unlawfulneſs in them; particularly not in *the ſign of the Croſs*, *Kneeling at the Communion*, *the Religious Obſervation of Holidays*, *the conſtant Uſe of the Lyturgy*, nor *the Uſe of God-Fathers*, *and God-Mothers in Baptiſm*. The Lawfulneſs of all which, except *that of the conſtant Uſe of the Lyturgy*, which he Acknowledges done very well to his hand by Dr. *Falkner*, he defends by Anſwering whatſoever was urg'd againſt them by his Adverſaries. *Pag.* 332, 333. *&c.*

And yet in the Preface, *p.* 83. he repreſents it as moſt adviſeable, either *wholly to take away the Sign of the Croſs*, *or to leave it Indifferent as the Parents ſhall deſire*, *or not deſire*: beſides which he would have Kneeling at the Sacrament diſ-

penſed

penſed with as to thoſe that ſcruple it----and ſeveral Alterations made in the ſetled Practice of our Church, as to the Uſe of God-Fathers and God-Mothers in Baptiſm. And to juſtifie this changing of our Church-Conſtitutions, he makes uſe of ſuch a Motive and Argument, as the truth is, if it prove any thing, proves thoſe Conſtitutions unlawful, and therefore that they ought to be aboliſh'd.

For, 1. What leſs than this can reaſonably be inferr'd from theſe words of his, *p.* 82. *I do think it would be a part of Chriſtian Wiſdom and Condeſcenſion in the Governours of our Church, to remove thoſe Barrs* (that is, the matter of the Diſſenters ſcruplings and exceptings againſt the Sacramental Offices) *from a freedome in joyning in full Communion with us.*] The moſt obvious and pertinent meaning of which words is, That it is ſuch a part of Wiſdome and Condeſcenſion as Chriſtianity obliges our Governors to; and if they are obliged to it by vertue of the Chriſtian Religion, it is certainly their duty to be ſo Wiſe and Condeſcending.

But 2. in the immediately preceding Lines, he urges this Argument for that Condeſcenſion; (*viz.*) becauſe *the Uſe of Sacraments in a Chriſtian Church* [*ought*] *to be the moſt free from all Exception*; and they [*ought*] *to be ſo Adminiſtred,*

ſtred, as rather to invite, than diſcourage ſcrupulous Perſons from joyning in them. Which Argument, if valid, will effectually deſtroy, not only the preſcription of thoſe Ceremonies, but ſeveral other things of the like kind, which *the men of Scruples* are, or ſhall be pleaſed to except againſt; particularly, 'twill be as valid againſt the Uſe of a ſet Form of words in thoſe and other ſacred Adminiſtrations, becauſe even that, diſcourages abundance of ſcrupulous Perſons from joyning in any of the Publick Services of our Church; all which therefore will be effectually deſtroyed by that Argumentation.

Beſides which, he mentions *p.* 92. ſeveral other mutations for the ſatisfaction of the ſcrupulous, which *p.* 93. he thinks reaſonable to be allowed in order to an Union, As *the explaining or amending ſome more doubtful and obſcure paſſages in the Common-Prayer-Book; the uſe of the New Tranſlation of the Pſalms, (in Parochial Churches at leaſt) the charging of the Apochrypha-Leſſons, for portions of Canonical Scripture; the leaving at liberty thoſe Expreſſions in the Office for Burial, which ſuppoſe the good Eſtate of the Perſon buried: the reſtoring the Rubrick about the Salvation of Infants, to its former place in the Office of Confirmation, and ſo removing the preſent exceptions againſt it*: by which laſt I confeſs,

I do

I do not well know what he means; becauſe I do not diſcern how the placing it in the Office of Confirmation, will remove the preſent ſcruples againſt it; thoſe ſcruples being about its truth; and the Propoſition contain'd in that Rubrick will certainly be no truer in one Office, than in the other.

Now ſince 'tis plain that the Preface does thus endeavour to undermine and deſtroy ſo many of our Church-Conſtitutions, which yet the Book endeavours to uphold and maintain; and ſince he does it by an Argument which if rational and cogent, does as plainly infer the continuing thoſe Conſtitutions, eſpecially thoſe of them that belong to the Sacraments, to be no part of Chriſtian Wiſdom and Condeſcenſion in our Governours, but inconſiſtent with it, and with that freeneſs, from all exceptions, which ought to be the conſtant Attendant of thoſe Adminiſtrations, I think 'tis evident that the Preface does, at leaſt virtually, and conſequentially, deſtroy, and render unlawful what the Book defends as lawful.

Nay I do not diſcern what conſiſtency there is between one part of the Preface, and another part; between the *allowing the fore-mentioned mutations as reaſonable and neceſſary*, (*Pag.* 82. and 93.) and this paſſage, *Pag.* 89. which implies they

they are neither necessary nor reasonable. For there he says, [*we do heartily and sincerely desire Union with our Brethren, if it may be had on just and reasonable Terms; but they must not think that we will give up the Cause of the Church for it, so as to condemn its Constitution, or make the Ceremonies unlawful which have been hitherto observed and practised in it: if any Expedient can be found out for the Ease of other mens Consciences, without reflecting on our own; if they can be taken in without Reproach, or dishonour to the Reformation of the Church, I hope no True Son of the Church of* England *will oppose it.*]

Now whether the fore-mention'd dispensings with, and Retrenchments of our Church-Orders and Practices, upon the fore-mention'd Reason and Argument for the sake of Union with them, whom he is pleas'd to call *Brethren*; be not so far a giving up the Cause of the Church, as to condemn its Constitution, and to make the Ceremonies unlawful, which have hitherto been observed and practised in it, I leave you to judge; as also whether the taking in Dissenters upon such Terms, will not necessarily reflect reproach and dishonour upon the Reformation of that Church, which at her first Reforming thought fit to retain and impose those Constitutions and Ceremonies as just and reasonable, and as such

hath ever ſince continu'd them, without imagining that continu'd Impoſition, inconſiſtent with Chriſtian Wiſdom, or with any regard that's juſtly due to the Scruples and Exceptions of troubleſome men, relating to the Adminiſtration of Sacraments in a Chriſtian Church. To which troubleſome Men the *Dr.* is pleaſed to give the Title of [*Brethren*] more than once in the later end of the Preface, which is it ſelf, in my Opinion, too abſurd a contradiction to that Book, whoſe main deſign is to prove them *Schiſmaticks*.

He tells us *Pag.* 364. That *'twas the great Wiſdom of our Church, not to make more things neceſſary as to Practice, than were made ſo at the Settlement of the Reformation; but whether there be ſufficient reaſon to alter thoſe Terms of Communion, which were then ſettled, for the ſake of ſuch whoſe Scruples are groundleſs, and endleſs, I do not* (ſays he) *take upon me here to determin.*

And I wiſh he had not ~~then~~ taken it upon him in the Preface; eſpecially to determin it, ſo much to the Reproach and Diſhonour of our Church, as to imply ſhe hath hitherto been guilty of Tranſgreſſing the Obligation of Chriſtianity, in not making thoſe Alterations for the ſake of Union, with ſuch Perſons whoſe Scruples are groundleſs and endleſs, and *which* (as himſelf Affirms *p.* 372.) *might be remov'd by a little Impartiality,*

partiality, and due conſideration; ----there being no depth of Learning, no ſubtilty of Reaſoning, no endleſs quotation of Fathers neceſſary about them; but the diſpute lies in ſuch a narrow compaſs, that men may ſee light if they will.

And why ours, or indeed any Church ſhould be Reproached as Defective in Chriſtian Wiſdom, for not complying with ſuch humerſom Perſons, or not altering her Conſtitutions for the ſake of ſuch wilfully blind and perverſe Diſſenters, I confeſs I do nor underſtand.

Now theſe Premiſes being duly conſider'd, do I think abundantly juſtifie the firſt charge, and make it too reaſonable to adhere to this concluſion, that *the Doctors Preface hath deſtroyed what he had ſaid for our Church in his Book.*

And in reference to the other charge, that *the Preface has effectually deſtroy'd that Church of* England *which the Doctor had taken pains to defend in his Book.* The ſame premiſes do really contribute ſo much to the making it good, that (for ought I ſee) no more need to be added to that End, than the bare application of them to that Cenſure, and to the Doctor's own Notion of *the Church of* England. For he aſſerts *p.* 249. of his Book, that *the National Church of* England *diffuſive, is the whole Body of Chriſtians in this Nation, conſiſting of Paſtors and People, agreeing*

in that Faith, Government and Worſhip, which are Eſtabliſh'd by the Laws of this Realm. ---And *Pag.* 302. *All Biſhops, Miniſters, and People, taken together, who profeſs the Faith ſo Eſtabliſh'd, and worſhip God according to the Rules ſo Appointed, make up this National Church of* England. And this is [the Church of *England*] which *the Doctor* has taken pains to defend in his Book.

If therefore *the Church of* England takes its denomination not only from the Profeſſion of that Faith, but alſo *from its conſent in Worſhipping God, according to ſuch and ſuch Rules*, he that would deſtroy *thoſe Rules*, will conſequently deſtroy that Church, which is denominated ſuch, and diverſified from *other Churches*, by *its embracing and adhering to thoſe Rules*. But it appears from the premiſes, that the *Doctor*'s Preface would have ſeveral conſiderable Alterations made of thoſe Rules, and that upon ſuch an account, and for ſuch reaſons, as do conſequentially deſtroy that Order, and thoſe Rules of Worſhip that are Eſtabliſhed by Law; and therefore that Preface does effectually deſtroy *that Church of* England which he had taken pains to defend in his Book.

Theſe are all the things, (ſays the Dr.) *which appear to me reaſonable to be Allowed in order to an Union: and which I ſuppoſe may be Granted without*

without detriment, or dishonour to our Church; And (says this Writer) *these are all I plead for in this Book.*

But 1. there is this little difference between these Authors; The *Reverend Dean* supposes they [may be] Granted, but this Author endeavours to prove they [ought] to be Granted.

2. Though that Author mentions only such and such things as appearing to him reasonable to be Allowed, yet to make them appear so to others, he urges an Argument which will infer it as reasonable to dispense with a great many other things not mentioned. And so though this Author pretends that these are all he pleads for in his Book, yet the Arguments he makes use of, if they prove any thing, prove it the duty of our Governours to dispense with a great many more Constitutions; even all that enjoyn any Indifferents, whereby our Brother is offended. (*Chap.* 3.)

And therefore whereas he adds here: *As for those who deny the lawfulness of Lyturgy, and the right Constitution of our Churches, and who would be exempted from the Jurisdiction of their Bishop, and set up Congregations separate and independent upon him; I know not how to plead for them, without pleading for Schism, Confusion and Disorder.*

I doubt

I doubt his Arguments will, if they prove any thing, prove it as unlawful for Governours to impoſe a Lyturgy, and require Obedience to Epiſcopal Government, as to impoſe Ceremonies. For I am confident he is very ſenſible that a great many whom he ſeemed to account *weak Brethren*, are mightily offended with thoſe Conſtitutions alſo: And I doubt himſelf is not ſo ſtrong and hardy, as to affirm that our Lyturgy and Dioceſan Epiſcopacy, are things founded on a Divine unchangeable Law. And if they be not, his Arguments will conclude againſt them, as well as againſt the impoſition of Ceremonies.

As for the Teſtimonies which follow *pag.* 23. 24. *&c.* my Remarks on them are theſe:

1. Some of them I confeſs ſeem to ſpeak home to this Author's deſign: and pretend that our Ceremonies *ought to be aboliſh'd*: but if this Man's Book be fraught with no better Reaſons to prove it than thoſe mention'd by him, out of the Epiſtles of *Judicious Beza*, and *Learned Zanchy*, I'll be bold to ſay that it is good for little, but to prove the Author a very weak Brother.

2. He ſhewed himſelf too near of kin to ſuch a Brother, in pretending *pag.* 23. That *Calvin* ſtyl'd our Ceremonies *Follies*, but owning that we

affirmed them *Tolerable Follies*, and then writing a great Book himself to prove them intolerable. But as to that Censure which *Calvin* is said to pass upon our Ceremonies, see *Durell's* [*Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*] *Cap.* 12. where he makes it more than probable, That that Censure was not meant of our Ceremonies, nor of the *English* Lyturgy as it was in it self at that time: but as it was knavishly represented to him by the *English* Sectaries of those days.

3. I observe that several of his Testimonies *pag.* 38. *&c.* seem not to speak of the duty of the Governours of this or that particular Church, to bear with, and indulge the Members of their own Church, in matters indifferent, but of the Duty (only) of one Protestant Church (*pag.* 40. 41.) towards another: *viz.* That *if both Churches agree in Fundamentals---their differences in other matters may be Tolerated.* (*pag.* 38. 40.) *The Reformed Churches*, say the *Geneva*-Doctors, (*pag.* 40.) *ought to maintain a Brotherly Affection towards one another, &c. ---The Protestant-Churches*, says the Transylvanian, (*pag.* 41.) *are to be mov'd, notwithstanding their differences, to exercise Moderation, Compassion, and Mutual Toleration*----- And so the Professors of *Aberdeen*, (*pag.* 42. 43.)

The possibility of this Exception the *Preface*-himself

himſelf was aware of, and therefore endeavours to enervate it, *pag.* 57. by Asking, *What reaſon can be given why theſe conditions of Communion betwixt Reformed Churches, ſhould not obtain amongſt the Member of the ſame Chriſtian Church?* And *pag.* 58. *Why that Agreement in Fundamentals, which is ſufficient to preſerve Communion betwixt Churches diſagreeing in Rites and Ceremonies, and Doctrines of inferior moment, may not be ſufficient alſo to preſerve Communion among the members of the ſame Church, though diſagreeing in like matters?*

As if there where no difference, between two Societies, neither of which is ſubject to, or dependant upon the other, nor have any Governour common to them both; and the members of the ſame Society, or ſeveral Societies united under, and ſubject to ſuch or ſuch a Governour, or Governours. Where two Societies are independent one upon another, there being no common Governour to take care of Order, and the things relating to it among them; each of them is left to the management of its reſpective Governour or Governours; and to them the care of the Publick Worſhip to be perform'd by that Society belongs; who therefore ought to ſee that it be performed in an orderly, decent, and reverent manner, and to conſtitute ſuch Modes,

Rites,

Rites and Ceremonies, as they judge moſt convenient to that End: And when they have ſo done, what has any other Church, which, in the Caſe ſuppos'd, cannot juſtly pretend to any ſuperiority over them, I ſay, what has ſuch a Church to do to call in queſtion their Conſtitutions? in any Authoritative way, I mean. And therefore to talk of its being the duty of one Proteſtant Church to [*tolerate*] another, that's Independent upon it, and differs from it in matters of outward Order, is, at leaſt, a very improper way of ſpeaking. If by [*tolerating*] thoſe Teſtimonies mean only that they ſhould not Cenſure and Condemn the other Church that ſo differs from them, and if this Writer be of the ſame mind in this with the Authors of thoſe dictates, (and if he be not, why does he quote them as Teſtimonies favouring his pretenſions?) then himſelf ought to pronounce *Beza* and *Zanchy*, a little too pragmatical in quarrelling *the Governours of the Church of* England, for their thinking fit to retain ſuch and ſuch Ceremonies.

But what does this Prefacer mean by [*Conditions of Communion*] and [*Preſerving Communion*] in theſe queſtions? Does it follow that becauſe theſe Teſtimonies make it the Duty of one Proteſtant Church ſo far to Accord with another

that agrees with it in Fundamentals, and differs from it only in Rites and Ceremonies, or other matters extra-Fundamental, as [*not faſtidiouſly to reject, or Anathematiſe that Church. P.* 43.] on Account of any ſuch difference, that therefore they make it the duty of each Church to admit the members of the other Church, to [*all ſorts*] *of Communion* meerly becauſe *they agree in Fundamentals?* If he fancy that to be their meaning, let him inſtance if he can in any one *Proteſtant Church*, that will receive others to *Sacramental Communion* meerly becauſe they hold the Fundamentals of Chriſtian Faith.

This Man has undertaken to maintain, That things Indifferent ought not to be impoſed as Conditions of Communion, or as Conditions without which none ſhall partake of the publick Ordinances; but does he imagine that if he go to *Geneva*, he ſhall be admitted to the Communion there without ſubmitting to the *Ceremonies of Reception*, there enjoyn'd? in particular, that they'll give it him unleſs he [ſtands] when he receives it? I am ſure *Durell* in the forementioned *Vindiciæ*, *Cap.* 22. where he defends the Church of *Englands* impoſing Kneeling on all Communicants, tells us that in that it challenges no greater a Power to it ſelf, than other Reformed Churches do. (*pag.* 235.) And that

as

as the Churches of *the Lutheran Confeſſion* will give the Communion only to thoſe that *Kneel*; ſo the *French*, and *Geneva Churches* will give it to none but ſuch as *Stand* in the Act of Receiving.

Whereas therefore this Author would gladly know (*pag.* 58.) *Why that Agreement in Fundamentals, which is ſufficient to preſerve Communion betwixt Churches diſagreeing in Rites and Ceremonies ----- may not be ſufficient alſo to preſerve Communion among the Members of the ſame Church, though diſagreeing in ſuch Matters?*

I Anſwer, That the Communion which his own Teſtimonies ſpeak of as preſerv'd thereby, is only (for ought I ſee) that which conſiſts in *not Cenſuring and Anathematiſing, or Diſowning them as True Churches*, though differing in ſuch matters; which as it ſcarce deſerves the *Name* of *Communion*, ſo 'tis too far remov'd from the *Nature* of that *Communion* which this Book pleads for, to make theſe Teſtimonies pertinent to that Plea.

And whereas he pretends in the ſame Page, that the reaſon why Chriſtian Churches which do thus differ, ſhould be received and owned as Chriſtians, and Brethren of the ſame Communion with us is, *becauſe theſe differences do not hinder their being real Members of Chriſt's Body*,

I Anſwer, by denying that to be the true, and adequate Reaſon; for the true Reaſon is, becauſe in the Caſe ſuppoſed of two Churches independent one on the other, and not ſubject to any Common Governour, the one Church has no Power to impoſe Rites and Ceremonies on the other, and conſequently no ſufficient ground to quarrel with it meerly for diſagreeing from it in matter of Ceremony: but if any of the members of one of the Churches refuſe to ſubmit to the Rites appointed by their own proper Governours, their Agreement in Fundamentals is no ſufficient ground why either their own, or the other Church, ſhould *receive them to Sacramental Communion.*

He ſays indeed, that *thoſe Differences do not hinder their being real Members of Chriſts Body*: But 1. does he hold that every one who is really a member of Chriſts Body, ought *eo nomine*, to be admitted to all the Privileges of Chriſtian Communion? if he does, he muſt either deny that any real member of Chriſts Body can do any notorious wrong to his Neighbour by word or deed, or elſe he muſt condemn our Church for requiring the Miniſter of each Pariſh to repell ſuch a Perſon from the Communion, till either he makes actual recompence for the Injury, or declare himſelf fully reſolv'd to do it when

when conveniently he may. If not, then the meer conſideration that ſuch a man is really a a member of Chriſts Body does not oblige any (in whoſe Power it is) to admit him to all thoſe Privileges.

2. Does he hold that meer agreeing in Fundamentals is all that's required to the being a real member of Chriſt? If not, then neither is that ſufficient to qualifie a man for all the Privileges of Chriſtian Communion.

3. I ſuppoſe he will not deny that there are *Practical* as well as *Speculative* Fundamentals; and I preſume he is of Opinion, That Obedience to our Lawful Governours, in things Lawful, is one of the Fundamentals of *Practice*. If he denies the former, he contradicts the Doctrin of ſome of his own Teſtimonies; which affirm That *there are Fundamental Articles of Faith, without which, Chriſtian Faith cannot ſubſiſt, nor Everlaſting Life be obtain'd*: and That *there are* (alſo) *Fundamental Heads of Diſcipline.* (p. 56.) and that *thoſe are ſo which promote and maintain the means of Salvation, and without which we cannot live a Chriſtian Life.* And that *whoſoever periſhes, muſt be ſeparated from the Foundation by ſome Fundamental Error in Doctrin, or in Practice*: which ſuppoſes that there are Fundamentals of Practice, as well as Belief.

As

As to the latter, he confeſſes (*pag.* 187. of his Book) That *in thoſe matters which are not apparently forbidden by the clear Word of God, men ought to yield Obedience to the Commands of their Superiours*; and if he will own that they ought to do ſo *on pain of Damnation*, as I hope he will, then 'tis a *Fundamental Duty*, even in his own account. That Chriſtian therefore that does *not think it ſuch a Duty*, is by this Doctrin guilty of a *Fundamental Error* in reference to *Chriſtian Practice*; and he who does *think it his duty*, and does *not Act accordingly*, is guilty of a *damnable Neglect*.

Now I deſire to know of this Author

1. Whether *meer agreeing to Fundamentals*, whether of Belief, or Practice, that is, aſſenting to them, will conſtitute, and continue a man a real member of Chriſts Body, without, at leaſt, reſolving to Act accordingly, if there be not time for more, and the performance of that Reſolution if there be?

2. Whether differences in the Fundamentals of Practice, will not hinder men from being real members of Chriſts Body?

3. Whether though they agree in the Fundamentals of Practice, that is, own and aſſent to them, as matter of neceſſary Duty in order to Salvation, yet if they perſiſt in the Neglect of any

part of such Duty, they ought to be own'd by the Church, either as real members of Christ, or as Persons, to whom belong all the Privileges of Christian Communion? If he says they ought, I desire to know

4. Why they should be acknowledged as Persons rightly qualified for the Privileges of Christianity here, or its Rewards hereafter, who are either so Ignorant as not to know, or so negligent as not to Practise, that which Christianity has made Fundamentally necessary to Salvation, to be both Known and Practised?

Particularly I would willingly be inform'd by this man, whether he account the preservation of the External Unity of the particular Church, whether *National*, *Diocesan*, or *Parochial*, of which men are members, a Fundamental of Practice, or no. If he does, how can he account those Persons real members of Christs Body, who are so far from preserving that Unity in either of those Churches, that they industriously destroy it in all of them: not submitting themselves to the Rules of Order and Government, appointed for either of them? If he does not, then why does he 1. expresly Acknowledge, That *Schisms and Divisions, do apparently dissolve the Church-Unity?* And 2. (by asking those questions, *pag.* 28. of his Book) implicitely Acknowledge,

That

That *Perſons become Schiſmatical by refuſing to be One with us in Diſcipline, and by renouncing Communion with us in our Publick Worſhip, ſuppoſing there be nothing Evil in it?* And 3. pronounce all *Separate Congregations Schiſmatical, for their not being ſubject to the Government of our Dioceſans? p.* 59. And then 4. Acknowledge the Sin of *Schiſm* to be an *heinous, deſtructive, and pernicious Evil: one of thoſe fleſhly works, which they who do, ſhall not inherit the Kingdom of God.* (*Chap.* 2, *pag.* 24. 25.) It muſt follow therefore from his own Principles and Conceſſions, That they who are guilty of Schiſm, are guilty of Erring in a Fundamental of Practice.

Now ſince Schiſm is by his own Confeſſion ſo pernicious an Evil; ſince by his own Confeſſion, alſo refuſing to be *One* with the Church of *England*, in Communion with its Publick Worſhip, is a Breach and Diſſolution of Church-Unity, ſince alſo refuſing ſubjection to the Government of our Dioceſan Biſhops, is diſſolving the Unity of Diſcipline, and therefore Schiſmatical; and ſince all ſeparate Congregations in this Nation, are in his own Opinion, guilty of Schiſm, 'tis evident

1. That the members of thoſe Congregations, either do *Not Agree in all the Fundamentals of Practice*, or elſe do *Not Act ſuitably to that Agreement*:

Agreement, but are ſo far from it, that they perſiſt in Schiſmatical Practices, contrary to the dictate of their Judgement and Conſcience.

2. That they are not of the ſame Communion with us, and

3. That the Pleas which this Prefacer makes uſe of in their behalf, *pag.* 58. (*viz.*) Their Agreement in Fundamentals, and their being real members of Chriſts Body, are very inſufficient, becauſe by diſſolving (as much as in them lie,) the Unity of the Church of *England*, and its Diſcipline, they practically differ in a Fundamental of Chriſtianity. And by being *Schiſmaticks* they diſown themſelves to be Perſons of the ſame Communion with us, nay are guilty of a capital Error, and a cuſtomary Crime, which excludes men while impenitently perſever'd in, from the Kingdom of Heaven; and therefore they ought not while in thoſe circumſtances, to be accounted perſons of the ſame Communion with us, or real members of Chriſts Body.

I have now conſider'd ſeveral things, which I thought fit to be taken notice of in this Preface, and in the many Teſtimonies quoted by the Prefacer, as ſo many juſtifications of the deſign of his Book. But how ill they are ſuited to that purpoſe, at leaſt for the generality of them, is I think apparent enough from the Reflexions I have here

made upon them. But I with heartily I had been in or near ſome Library, where I might have had the opportunity of examining the quotations, and conſulting the Authors quoted; for then poſſibly I might have diſcovered much more impertinency in the quotations, and inſincerity in the quoter.

'Tis plain the Author has ingag'd himſelf in a very bold Attempt. He has undertaken to prove, That *things indifferent, which may be changed and altered without ſin, ought not, eſpecially under our preſent Circumſtances, to be impos'd by Superiours as the Conditions of Communion, or of miniſtration in Sacred Things.* And conſequently he has undertaken to prove, That all Churches or States, who have ſo impoſed Indifferents, have by that Impoſition, been guilty of violating the Law of God.

To Excuſe which Attempt from the prejudice of Singularity, he pretends *pag.* 3. to ſtrengthen it in his Preface, againſt that and other prejudices, *by the concurrent ſuffrages of many worthy perſons, both of our own and other Churches, who have declar'd themſelves* (as he would perſwade us) *to be of the ſame Judgment, and have purſu'd the ſame Deſign.*

Now beſides all that has been already objected to thoſe Suffrages, if I had the opportunity

of

of doing it, I would challenge the Author to evince, that any tolerable number of the Suffrages which he has produc'd, are pertinent and punctual to his deſign, as worded by himſelf.

That deſign conſiſts of Two Parts, one more general; *That things indifferent, which may be alter'd without Sin, ought not to be impos'd as the Condition of Communion, or miniſtration in Sacred Things.* The other more particular, That *eſpecially they ought not to be impos'd under our preſent Circumſtances, as the Conditions of Communion with us* (of the Church of *England.*)

The Suffrages produc'd to reſcue this deſign from the imputation of Singularity, (amount in the Contents of the Preface) to about 35. Now let him manifeſt if he can,

1. That ſo much as one of thoſe Suffrages ſpeaks particularly of *our* [*preſent*] *Circumſtances* here in *England.* I mean thoſe Circumſtances, that were preſent to the publiſhing of his Book.

2. Let him manifeſt if he can, That among his 35 Suffrages, there are ſo many as *five* that affirm it unlawful to make Indifferents, which are Alterable without Sin, the Conditions of Church-Communion, and Miniſtration. Nay I doubt he cannot manifeſt that ſo much as one of them comes fully up to this deſign of his Book: But if the major part, or two parts in

three of the Teſtimonies be impertinent, what ſhall we think of that man who has the confidence and conſcience to write at ſuch a rate, and pretend ſo much when the proof falls ſo intolerably ſhort of the pretenſe?

Beſides, if my memory fail me not, I have ſeen a Book heretofore, which Anſwer'd *Creſſy*, againſt Dr. *Pierce*'s Sermon, meerly by quoting paſſages out of Authors extant before that Book of *Creſſy*'s, which contained ſufficient Anſwers to the moſt material parts of it. And I believe that this Author could have done the like in reference to this Preface; I mean, that he could have heaped up as many and as pertinent Teſtimonie, out of the Writings of ſingle Perſons, and Acknowledgments of Church-Societies, in favour of this Poſition, That it is lawful to make things Indifferent which may be altered without Sin, the conditions of Church-Communion and Miniſtration, as he has pretended here in favour of the Contradictory; and if he could, I leave it to you to judge with what ſincerity he could profeſs (*Pref. pag.* 1.) that he was *moſt unwilling to do the leaſt diſ-ſervice to the Church of which he is a member*, when he has in this Preface done it the grand diſ-ſervice of heaping up ſuch a multitude of (pretended) Teſtimonies againſt the lawfulneſs of her Practice, and omitting the much

much greater number of pertinent Suffrages, which I have ſome reaſon to believe himſelf could have as eaſily produced in defence of that Practice.

But this Profeſſion of his is very obnoxious upon another Account; for if he were at all ſincere in making it, what ail'd him 1. to Print his Book at ſuch a time? And 2. in *Engliſh*, At ſuch a time? when he Acknowledges (*pag.* 9.) that the Biſhops themſelves have neither any Power to make ſuch Conceſſions, as his Book would have to be made, no nor any Power to *make any Propoſals for the healing of our breaches, till by his Majeſty's Authority they meet in Convocation, for that end*; And I do not think that this Gentleman had any proſpect of a Parliaments being called ſoon after the publication of his Book; or that it is an Article of his Faith, that his Majeſty may ſummon a Convocation to meet to that end, out of Parliament, and then what could the publiſhing of ſuch a Book at ſuch a time be, but the promoting on his part, that which has been of late the grand Fanatical Deſign of ſuch weak Brethren as *Baxter*, *Alſop*, *Troughton*, &c. *viz.* the rendring our Governors both in Church and State, odious by repreſenting their Conſtitutions as unlawful, and attempting to prove them contradictory both to the Commands and Example of *Chriſt* and his *Apoſtles*? But what ail'd him

him 2. to compoſe and print his Book in *Engliſh*? was it becauſe he expected either a *Parliament* or *Convocation*, whoſe major part ſhould be made up of Clergy-men, or Gentlemen ſo ill bred as not to underſtand *Latin*? or did not the Author underſtand it himſelf ſo well as to write a Book in it? or did he publiſh it in *Engliſh* for the ſake of the weak Brethren, and the devout Siſters, that they might be furniſhed with Arguments againſt *Ceremony-Impoſing-Laws*, from one end of the Goſpels and Epiſtles, to the other? For he has ſhewed himſelf ſo dexterous in diſcerning and multiplying prejudices, and exceptions againſt ſuch Conſtitutions, that 'tis to be hoped a little more improvement of his Topical Parts, may gain him *Parker*'s faculty of Eſpying in thoſe Impoſitions *in general*, as he did in the Uſe of the Croſs *in particular*, a contradiction to all the Ten Commandments.

Now for a man to put forth ſuch a Book againſt thoſe Impoſitions for the ſake of illiterate *Engliſh* men, who 1. have no power at preſent to retrench, or null, the Impoſitions; nor 2. are ever like to have: who 3. are like to make a moſt miſchievous uſe of it, to the diſhonour, and prejudice of the Church, and yet to pretend himſelf *moſt unwilling to do the leaſt diſ-ſervice to the Church*, is ſo palpably

Proteſtatio

Proteſtatio contra factum, that hardly any thing can be more ſo.

But why talks he only of doing diſ-ſervice to [*the Church*?] as if that only were concern'd, when the contents and deſign of his Book, caſt as great a ſlur upon, and tend as much to the reproach and diſparagement of [*the State*] as of [*the Church*;] for he knows well enough, that the Laws enjoyning Uniformity, and impoſing our Ceremonies, are made *by the King*, and that with the Conſent not only of the *Lords Spiritual*, but *Temporal* alſo, and *the Commons*; ſo that this Author in thus attempting to prove thoſe Laws repugnant to the Law of God, and inconſiſtent with ſo many of the grand momentous obligations of Chriſtianity, is ſo far from ſhewing himſelf unwilling to do diſ-ſervice to the *Church*, that he has ſpent a great deal of time and pains, and employed (as one may gueſs) the utmoſt of his Art and Induſtry, to do as great a diſ-ſervice *to that, and the State both*, as (for ought I know) he could poſſibly do it with his Pen; for what greater diſ-ſervice can there be done *in that way* to any Government, than to Aſſert and Maintain a Poſition, from which it follows by undeniable conſequence; That the Governours of this or that Nation, have for multitudes of Years ſucceſſively agreed, in Enacting Laws contradictory

tradictory to the Practice and Commands, the Exhortations, Arguings, and Examples of both Chriſt and his Apoſtles?

For this is the immediate conſequent of this Poſition, and his manner of proving it, That *Superiours ought not to impoſe things Indifferent and Alterable without Sin, as the Conditions of Church-Communion, and Miniſtration.*

Beſides, what greater Affront could be offer'd to *the King himſelf*, then to publiſh ſuch a Book, at that very time when *His Majeſty* gave ſuch demonſtration of his Reſolutions to uphold and defend the Act for Uniformity, and of his Zeal for the *Church*, by requiring a ſtrict and vigorous Execution of the Laws againſt Diſſenters?

This man's undertaking therefore thus manag'd, in contradiction to the Laws of the Land, at a time when the King himſelf and inferiour Magiſtrates were more induſtriouſly zealous in executing thoſe Laws, than they have been for many years, is in my Opinion ſuch a daring and impudent pragmaticalneſs, as ought to be encountered and chaſtiſed with a Puniſhment as notorious as the Crime.

Eſpecially ſince, as was before intimated, I doubt not but this very Writer could have fill'd as many ſheets as this Preface contains, with Teſtimonies juſtifying the Conſtitutions of

our

our Church and State in matters indifferent; and I am confident, had I had but my own Library about me, three parts whereof are ſtill at *Oxford*, I could have done ſo my ſelf. But in ſome of the few Books I have here, I meet with ſuch paſſages, as abundantly confirm me in that Confidence; and withall make me very much ſuſpect this Prefacer's ſincerity and ingenuity, in quoting. For whereas he has in this Preface quoted *Beza* as an Enemy to all Symbolical Rites, (*pag.* 25) and affirming that *they ſhould be entirely excluded from the Chriſtian Church*; and *Zanchy* as an Enemy to our Ceremonies---- and beſides pretended *pag.* 35. That 'twere endleſs to ſet down all that *Bucer*, *Calvin*, *Chamier*, *Daneus*, *Farel*, *Povanus*, *Urſin*, and *Zipper*, *with many others*; *have ſaid againſt the Uſe and Impoſition of them*, and [pag. 36.] *that* Caſſander *teſtifies* (without telling us where he ſo teſtifies) *that moſt have conceiv'd them fit to be condemned and aboliſhed as foppiſh, ludicrous, ridiculous, yea as noxious and pernicious.* *Durell* has given us ſuch a different Account of things, as is very oppoſite to this *Prefacer's* pretenſions.

For in his forementioned Book, *Cap.* 17. He Affirms that the Chriſtian Church, from the Apoſtles time to this day, was never without, nor *in the judgment of the moſt Learned and Famous*

Proteſtants, either can or ought to be without ſome ſignificant Ceremonies, *pag.* 182. to which purpoſe he quoted the ſentiments of *Luther*, *Melanchthon*, and *Calvin*, *pag.* 186. and then ſaid: I could here produce very many more of the moſt Learned, and Renowned Perſons in the Reformed Churches, of the ſame Opinion with *Luther*, *Melanchthon* and *Calvin*, *in this point.* Nor ſays he, do I remember to have read any Reform'd Writer of any Note, eſpecially of thoſe who were at the beginning of the Reformation, (whoſe Judgment and Authority is principally to be attended to in this diſpute) who Condemns ſignificant Ceremonies meerly as ſuch, if ſo be no ſupernatural vertue be attributed to them, for the producing Spiritual Effects; nor Religion placed in them, nor Merit, or Juſtification expected from the uſe of them. Out of which number he do's not except *Beza* himſelf: but proceeds to Vindicate him as to that very Paſſage which this Prefacer has quoted out of his Epiſtle to Biſhop *Grindal*, (as if it were for his turn) and manifeſts that it ought not to be underſtood of ſuch Symbolical Rites as are deſign'd to ſignifie only mens duty, but ſuch only as are meant to ſignifie and exhibit Spiritual Priviledges, and the Divine Grace. And in his *Sixteenth Chapter*, he largely Anſwers that *Epiſtle*

of

of Zanchy, quoted at large by this Prefacer, *pag.* 28. &c. againſt impoſing Linnen Garments, and moſt of his Anſwers are taken out of *Calvin*, *Bucer*, *P. Martyr*, and *Zanchy* himſelf.

And as to our Churches retaining the Uſe of *the Croß in Baptiſm*, its *Thirtieth Canon* Acquaints us that *That reſolution and practice hath been allowed and approved----- by the Harmony of Confeſſions of later years.*

Now this Aſſertion of the Compoſers of that Canon, and thoſe other of *Durell* as to the number of Perſons approving the Impoſition of Ceremonies, makes me very much ſuſpect this Author's ingenuity, and honeſty in quoting.

And I doubt he has contented himſelf with quoting many Teſtimonies (beſides thoſe out of *Geſſelius*,) *pag* 38. &c. only by Retale, and at ſecond hand from others, without examining the quotations himſelf, and conſulting the paſſages as they lye in the Original Authors ; which is an intolerable Neglect in any man that undertakes to Write and Publiſh a Diſcourſe and Preface, *of this Nature and Conſequence.*

And one quotation which makes me ſuſpect this, is that *Pag.* 45. and 46. out of *Baxter's Diſput. of Human Ceremonies. Chap.* 24. (it ſhould be 14.) *Sect.* 3. *R.* 2. where he ſays: *'Tis ſhrewdly Argued by Mr.* Baxter (againſt our

Ceremonies) -----*This ſeems to be coming after Chriſt, to amend his Laws, correct his Works, and make better Laws and Ordinances for his Church, than he himſelf hath done; for if Chriſt would have ſuch Rites impoſed on the Churches, he could better have done it himſelf, than have left it to man; for theſe Rites are equally neceſſary, or unneceſſary throughout all Ages, and in all Places where Chriſtianity obtains. If Croſſing, Kneeling, Surplice, be needful to be uſed in the Church of* England, *why not in all the Churches of the Saints? If they are needful or expedient, for Order, Uniformity, for Reverence and Decency in this Age; Why not in that in which our Lord and his Apoſtles liv'd, and through all ſubſequent Ages of the Church? If therefore Chriſt did neither by himſelf nor his Apoſtles, who form'd the firſt Church, and deliver'd us his mind, inſtitute and impoſe theſe Rites, then either the impoſing them is needleſs, or elſe you muſt ſay that Chriſt hath omitted what was needful to the due performance of his Worſhip; which ſeemeth to imply that either he was ignorant what to do, or careleſs and neglective of his own Affairs: which cannot be Aſſerted without Blaſphemy.*

A ſhrewd Argument I confeſs, in the conſequences of it; if allowed for a good Argument, but 'tis really ſo pitiful a Ratiocination, *as to this Prefacer's deſign in quoting it*, that I believe

Baxter

Baxter himſelf has Wit and Reaſon enough ſtill left him, if ſtill living, to laugh at any man that ſhould be wheedl'd by it into a perſwaſion that it is unlawful for any Church or State, to impoſe ſuch and ſuch Rites and Ceremonies, as it thinks moſt convenient for Order, Uniformity, Reverence, and Decency, *Becauſe thoſe Ceremonies were never impoſed by Chriſt, or his Apoſtles.*

But that which I mention it for is this, to manifeſt what kind of quoter this man hath ſhewn himſelf.

Any Reader who views the quotation, and the lines of it mark'd each of them with two little hooks, may juſtly think that the lines ſo mark'd conſiſt only of *Baxter*'s words, and in the ſame order as diſpoſed by *Baxter* himſelf in that Chapter, Section, and Reaſon: but it is ſo far from being ſo, that

1. Theſe words [*This ſeems to be coming after Chriſt, to amend his Laws, correct his Works, and make better Laws and Ordinances for his Church, than he himſelf hath done,* are not *Baxter*'s words (in that Paragraph of that Diſputation, as Printed with the other four in 1659. which I believe is the only Edition of thoſe Diſputations of *Church-Government*) but this man's own ; unleſs he has quoted them at ſecond hand from ſome falſifyer of Teſtimonies.

2. Whereas

2. Whereas in the quotation 'tis, *If they* (viz. Croſſing, Kneeling, Surplice) *are needful or expedient for Order, Uniformity, for Reverence, and Decency in this Age, why not in that in which our Lord and his Apoſtles liv'd, and through all ſubſequent Ages of the Church?* this Clauſe alſo and Queſtion, is not Mr. *Baxters*, but this mans own or ſome body's that has impoſed upon him.

3. Whereas the Prefacer concludes the quotation with theſe words [*which cannot be Aſſerted without Blaſphemy*] *Baxter's* words are (only) [*which are not to be imagined,*]

Now 2. Neither of theſe variations are allowable in any Teſtimony that is publiſhed as a juſt and exact quotation, as any Reader would gueſs this to be, by the manner of printing it. But

3. The ſecond Clauſe is ſuch an addition, as is altogether intolerable; for *Baxter* doth not there diſpute againſt the Ceremonies of Croſſing and Surplice, conſidered *as expedient for Order, Uniformity, Reverence, and Decency.* But as (things pretended by him to be) *Myſtical, Symbolical, Sacramental Rites*; and his reaſoning (ſuch as it is) is there directed againſt them *only under that Notion*: for this Author therefore to quote him as there applying that reaſoning to our Ceremonies, conſidered as *Needful or Expedient for Order, Uniformity,*

formity, &c. is not to *quote* but to *invent* and *falſifie*, and therefore

4. If the reſt of this Gentleman's quotations which I have not the opportunity of examining, are of the ſame complexion with this, he muſt in all reaſon be concluded either a Knaviſh quoter himſelf, or a quoter at ſecond hand, from ſome body that was ſo.

But ſuppoſing *Baxter* had reaſon'd ſo ſimply (as for ought I know he may in ſome other part of his writings) as this Prefacer makes him to do in that Paragraph, againſt mens appointing ſuch and ſuch Ceremonies, as needful for Order, Uniformity, Reverence, and Decency, I ſhall annex an wholſome *Teſtimony-Antidote* againſt the venom of it, which I find quoted to my hands from Mr. *Calvin* (I hope with more honeſty and fidelity than this is to Mr. *Baxter*) by Dr. *Hooke* (in his judicious Anſwer to *Baxter's Petition for Peace*, *pag.* 150. in theſe words.

Let us hold thsi, That if we ſee in every Society of men ſome Policy to be neceſſary, which may ſerve to nouriſh common Peace, and to retain Concord; if we ſee that in the doing of things there is always ſome Orderly Form which is behoveful for publick honeſty, and for very humanity not to be refus'd, the ſame ought chiefly to be obſerved in Churches which are both beſt maintained by a well-

well-fram'd diſpoſition of all things, and without Agreement are no Churches at all. Therefore if we will have the ſafety of the Church well provided for, we muſt altogether diligently procure that which St. Paul *commandeth, That all things be done Comely, and according to Order. But foraſmuch as there is ſo great diverſity in the manners of men, ſo great variety in minds, ſo great diſagreements in judgements and wits, neither is there any Policy ſtedfaſt enough, unleſs it be Eſtabliſhed by certain Laws, nor any orderly uſage can be obſerved without a certain appointed Form; therefore we are ſo far off from condemning the Laws that are profitable to this purpoſe, that we affirm that when theſe be taken away, Churches are diſſolved from their ſinews, and utterly deformed and ſcatter'd abroad; for this which St.* Paul *requireth, That all things be done decently and in Order, cannot be had, unleſs the Order it ſelf and Comelineſs, be Eſtabliſhed with obſervations adjoyned as with certain Bonds.*

But this only thing is always to be excepted in thoſe Obſervations. That they be not either believed to be neceſſary to Salvation, and ſo bind Conſciences with Religion, or be applyed to the Worſhip of God, and ſo Godlineſs be repoſed in them.---- But (pag. 152.) it is good yet to define more plainly what is comprehended under that

Comelineſs

Comelineſs which St. *Paul commendeth, and alſo what under Order. The end of Comelineſs is partly that when ſuch Ceremonies are uſed as may procure a Reverence to holy things, we may by ſuch helps be ſtirred up to Godlineſs: partly alſo, that the Modeſty and Gravity which ought to be ſeen in all honeſt doings, may therein principally appear. In Order, this is the firſt Point, That they which Govern may know the Rule and Law to Govern well, and the People which are governed may be Accuſtom'd to Obeying of God, and to right Diſcipline. Then, that the ſtate of the Church being well fram'd, Peace and Quietneſs may be provided for. Verily becauſe the Lord hath in his holy Oracles both faithfully contain'd, and clearly ſet forth both the whole ſum of true Righteouſneſs, and all the parts of the Worſhipping of his Divine Majeſty, and whatſoever was neceſſary to Salvation, therefore in theſe things, he is only to be heard as our School-Maſter. But becauſe in outward Diſcipline and Ceremony, his Will was not to preſcribe each thing particularly what we ought to follow, becauſe he foreſaw this to hang upon the ſtate of Times, and did not think one Form to be fit for all Ages, herein we muſt flee to thoſe general Rules which he hath given, that thereby all thoſe things ſhould be tryed which the neceſſity of the Church ſhall require to be Commanded for Order and Comelineſs.*

Finally, foraſmuch as he hath therefore taught nothing expreſly, becauſe theſe things are not neceſſary to Salvation, and according to the Manners of every Nation and Age, ought diverſly to be applyed to the Edifying of the Church, therefore as the Profit of the Church ſhall require, it ſhall be convenient as well to Change and Abrogate thoſe that be uſed, as to inſtitute New. I grant indeed, that we ought not raſhly, nor oft, nor for light Cauſes to run to Innovation, but what may hurt or edifie, Charity ſhall beſt judge, which if we ſuffer to be the Governeſs, all ſhall be ſafe.

Now it is the duty of Chriſtian People, to keep ſuch things as have been ordain'd according to this Rule with a free Conſcience, and without any ſuperſtition, but yet with a godly and eaſie readineſs to obey, not to deſpiſe them, nor to paſs them over with careleſs negligence: ſo far is it off, that they ought by Pride and Obſtinacy openly to break them. What manner of Liberty of Conſcience, wilt thou ſay, may there be in ſo great Obſervation and Warineſs? Yes, it ſhall ſtand excellently well: when we ſhall conſider, that they are not ſtedfaſt and perpetual ſtayed Laws whereunto we are bound, but outward rudiments for the weakneſs of men, which though we do not all need, yet we do all uſe them, becauſe we are mutually bound to one another, to nouriſh Charity among us.

Thus,

Thus, ſays Dr. *Hooke*, Mr. *Calvin delivers his judgment directly contrary to yours*, (meaning *Mr.* Baxter's, as expreſſed in that Petition for Peace) I add, and directly contrary to that which our *Prefacer* here quotes as his ſhrew'd Argumentation, but) *perfectly conſentient to the Church of* England, *and we find his practice according with his judgment; he put the Yoke of Diſcipline upon the Neck of the Senate and People of* Geneva, *and bound them to it with an Oath: and he declares for a Form of Prayers and Eccleſiaſtical Rites, from which it may not be lawful for the Paſtors to depart in their Function.*-----

You ſee hereby how far *Calvin* was from the Opinion, That Churches either *ſhould be govern'd* without Ceremonies, or indeed *can be govern'd*, if nothing be impoſed on their Members, but what is neceſſary.

I know 'tis eaſie to dictate as ſome men are ſaid to do in this Preface, That *all neceſſary things are ſo plain in Scripture, that men may ſoon agree in what is neceſſary, and conclude the no-neceſſity of agreeing in more. pag.* 12.----- That *all things neceſſary to be believed, are done in order to acceptance with God, are fully and perſpicuouſly contained in Holy Scripture, and therefore 'tis unreaſonable to exact further of our Brethren, that which is confeſſed unneceſſary, and which neither our*

Saviour, nor his Apoſtles impoſed on their Diſciples, (*pag.* 46.) That *neceſſary points* (*pag.* 20.) *may and will by* [*all honeſt people*] *be known and determin'd by the clear Teſtimony of Scripture, by conſent of Fathers, by general Tradition.*---- (As if all honeſt People could find out the conſent of Fathers, or be ſo familiarly acquainted with general Tradition.) *and other points need not to be determined.* -----That *all Confeſſions of particular Churches ſhould be aboliſhed* (*pag.* 53.) *and one publick Symbol agreed on, which ſhould be expreſſed only in the words of Scripture, and want nothing which is neceſſary to Salvation, to be known or done, nor contain any thing which is not thus neceſſary to Salvation.*-------*and in unneceſſaries there ſhould be a mutual bearing one with another*------ *That conſent in Fundamentals ought to be carefully maintain'd, but in other things neglected.* (*pag.* 55.) *That there ſhould be nothing in our Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, that may give any plauſible pretence for Separation or Nonconformity*---- (*pag.* 21.)

Now theſe, I confeſs, are ſeveral of them, very fine Aerial Speculations; ſuch as is no very difficult thing for *Mercurial Wits* to light on; and 'tis as eaſie for any Melancholy, Contemplative Man, to warm his Brains into a conceit of their Truth, Worth, and Excellency. But *loquere ut videam*: I would fain ſee the Man that either

has

has prov'd them, or can prove them to be *Practicable Notions*. I mean, ſuch as may be prudently applyed to the conſtituting or continuing of Societies, or to the maintaining of a publick conſent, or a common order and *decorum* among 'em. It may be a great Truth that *all things neceſſary to Salvation are plainly and clearly revealed in Scripture*; but that they are all ſo plain that all may ſoon agree in what is neceſſary, or that all honeſt People may know and determin all ſuch points, or that only ſuch ſhould be agreed in and enjoyn'd, I ſhall conclude to be very unpracticable Notions, till this Gentleman or ſomebody for him, can tell me *Firſt*, What Perſon, or Perſons, have ſo much as pretended to give an exact Liſt and Catalogue in *particular* of all thoſe Fundamentals which *in general* we profeſs to Believe, plainly contain'd in Scripture. 2. Where that Society of Chriſtians is to be met with, which is govern'd only by union and conſent in things abſolutely neceſſary? Or 3. where that Proteſtant Church is to be found, where nothing of Ceremony is impoſed either for Order, Decency, or Uniformity?

If no ſuch inſtance can be produc'd, 'tis a pregnant evidence that ſuch Theories and Principles, are inflexible to the meaſure and ends of Government, incompatible with the duty of Gover-

Governours, and with the neceſſities of the Perſons and Societies that are to be govern'd; and therefore they ſeem calculated only for the Meridian of *Utopia*, or *Cracovia*, and may ſerve indifferently for all *Latitudinarian Regions*, and *Anarchical Routs*.

You ſee, Sir, by this Packet how great a trouble your generoſity in ſending me [*The Proteſtant Reconciler*] has drawn upon you; no leſs than that of reading ſeveral Sheets of Animadverſions on the Preface; but you may comfort your ſelf with believing that your Trouble will end here, as mine does. For having not my own Books by me, ſcarce any of them I mean, that might be ſerviceable for ſuch a purpoſe, 'twill be a vanity for me to attempt the Confutation of the Prefacer's Book; eſpecially ſince he has been pleas'd to intereſs Dr. *Womock* (a much more conſiderable Perſon, and ſtill living I hope) in the Contents of it, inſomuch that if he ſhall think fit to make any Reply to him, his Book will, I believe, neither require, nor deſerve any other or better Confutation, than will reſult from that Defence. It was but the beginning of this Month that I receiv'd it from your kindneſs; and having ſince ſpent all this pains about the Preface, you cannot imagine I have ſo much as read the Book; But however, I have ſo far conſider'd the Con-

Contents of its Chapters, and glanced upon ſo many parts of the Book, that I conjecture the main ſtreſs and turn of the Cauſe lies in the fourth Chapter, which therefore whoſoever ſolidly Anſwers, will effectually baffle the deſign of this Writer, and may let the reſt of the Book take its courſe; and permit the weak Brethren to make the beſt Advantage they can of it. When you have peruſed theſe Papers, I hope you will impartially communicate your ſenſe of them to

Your Cordial Friend, and

Febr. 28.
$168\frac{2}{3}$.

Humble Servant,

S. T.